



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,344	07/27/2001	In Kwon Jeong	ORL-006	1220

7590

06/02/2003

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348 2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132

EXAMINER

MACARTHUR, SYLVIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,344

Applicant(s)

JEONG, IN KWON

Examiner

Sylvia R MacArthur

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-23, drawn to a system for polishing surfaces, classified in class 156, subclass 345.22.
 - II. Claims 24-46, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 156, subclass 345.22.
 - III. Claims 47-56, drawn to a method of processing objects to be polished, classified in class 216, subclass 38.
 - IV. Claims 57-66, drawn to a method of processing objects to be polished, classified in class 216, subclass 38.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require the interface mechanisms. The subcombination has separate utility such as a cluster tool without post polishing.
3. Inventions I and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice

Art Unit: 1763

another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method could be performed by another apparatus such as one without the interface mechanism.

4. Inventions I and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method could be performed by another apparatus such as one without the supplying mechanism.

5. Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method be performed with a materially different apparatus one without the supply unit.

6. Inventions II and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method could be performed without a post polishing step.

7. Inventions III and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as

Art Unit: 1763

claimed such as the post polishing unit. The subcombination has separate utility such as one without requiring a first and second object transfer.

8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different search, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

9. During a telephone conversation with Thomas Ham on 3/12/03 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-23. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 24-66 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1763

12. Claims 1-8, 10-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aizawa et al (US 6,036,582).

Regarding claim 1, 10, and 21: Aizawa teaches polishing units 10a, 10b. Transferring robots 20a, 20b (interface mechanisms/dual functioning object transfer mechanism) are attached to a carriage. The upper hand of the robot 20a holds wafers which are to be polished and wafer which have been dried, while the lower hand transports wafers that have been polished.

Regarding claims 2 and 8: Aizawa cites that buffing unit 200 (post polishing unit/first object cleaner) serves to clean the semiconductor wafers which have been polished by the polishing units 10a, 10b.

Regarding claims 3, 6, and 7: Aizawa teaches a loading/unloading unit 14 (supply unit) housing a pair of storage cassettes 12a, 12b (object storage housing).

Regarding claim 11: The robots 20a, 20b are disposed on rails 16a, 16b to have access to different sections of the supply unit.

Regarding claims 12-16, cleaning devices 26a-26c (second-fourth object cleaners) are discussed in col. 6 lines 38-47

Regarding claims 4, 5, 17-20 and 23: The four hands 38-38d provided on robots 20a and 20b are movable vertically for entry into the upper or lower space in delivery gate 18. Col. 7 lines 15-29 cite that a loading/unloading unit 14 is provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1763

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aizawa in view of Wang (US 5,948,203).

The teachings of Aizawa were discussed above.

Aizawa fails to teach a thickness measurement unit.

Wang teaches an optical dielectric thickness monitor 42 for CMP (a form of cleaning). The motivation to provide the monitor in a cleaning device as cited by Wang in col. 3 lines 6-19 is that it provides timely thickness measurements on the layer being cleaning. Thus, ensuring a more efficient and reliable cleaning process.

It would have been obvious to modify the apparatus of Aizawa with the thickness monitor of Wang to ensure the efficient optimal cleaning result.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sylvia R MacArthur whose telephone number is 703-306-5690. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F during the core hours of 8 a.m. and 2 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills can be reached on 703-308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9630 for regular communications and 703-872-9630 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 09/917,344

Page 7

Art Unit: 1763


Sylvia R. MacArthur

May 30, 2003


GREGORY MILLS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700